



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3345312 8 Sheepcote Close Hounslow TW5 9RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Irfan Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is 01339/8/P1.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a crossover on the public pathway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a crossover on the public pathway at 8 Sheepcote Close Hounslow TW5 9RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01339/8/P1, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan and Unnumbered Proposed Plan (rec'd by the Council 24.4.24).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling on the side of the road facing the turning head towards the end of a small residential cul de sac. The houses have open plan frontages and many have front garden parking. Street parking is unrestricted and a block of garages is nearby to serve many of the homes. The proposal is as above.
 4. The Council is concerned that the scheme would have sub standard visibility splays and inadequate scope for pedestrian refuge between splays.
 5. This property fronts what is, by any measure, an extremely lightly used footway towards the end of the small cul de sac. I would agree that technically the Appellant could not guarantee the full extent of the visibility splays in perpetuity due to third party land ownership. However, the requisite parts of the splays are modest and importantly across open plan very low level frontages. To my eye the open plan nature of the whole of this small estate would seem to be well established and I would expect that it is controlled by planning or covenant restriction. In all likelihood it would appear that intervisibility across front gardens will continue. Furthermore, the stretch of footway is straight, clear of any intruding vegetation, and fully open to view.
-

There is ready scope for pedestrians to have refuge to avoid any manoeuvring vehicles and such movements would be minimal in any event as each front garden only has room for one car and there is no passing traffic or any great number of vehicles turning in. I am satisfied that this is presently a safe environment and would continue to be so with the appeal proposal in place. It is a very different situation from that found in most of the Borough's streets.

6. Policy EC2 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that crossovers are suitably considered via adopted parking policy and that these and associated development would not prejudice highway and pedestrian safety. In October 2016 the Council produced: *Residential Crossover and Off-Street Parking Policy* (PP) which sets out detailed requirements for these matters. The appeal scheme would not meet every dimensional requirement set out as *likely* to be needed within the PP. However given the characteristics of this site and proposal, I conclude the appeal scheme would not conflict the over-arching *objective* of the LP policy or the PP document. In this, somewhat atypical, case of a cross over proposal there would be no undue public harm or risk from the scheme and the benefits to the Appellant carry significant weight.
7. I would add that the site lies within the Cranford Village Conservation Area. The Council raises no concerns on heritage asset issues and I would also conclude that this benign scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

Conditions

8. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I agree with this for the avoidance of doubt. I do not agree with the Council's box-tick that the materials would have to match the existing house.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR